



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

25
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,832	03/09/2004	Christopher Goode	SEDN/121CON	5683
56015	7590	02/21/2008	EXAMINER	
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP/ SEDNA PATENT SERVICES, LLC 595 SHREWSBURY AVENUE SUITE 100 SHREWSBURY, NJ 07702			PENG, FRED H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2623	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/21/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/797,832	GOODE, CHRISTOPHER
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Fred Peng	2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 March 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 09 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All . b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>03/09/2004</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-5, 7 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rudrapatna et al (US 5,592,470).

Regarding Claim 1, Rudrapatna discloses a method for increasing channel utilization in a video broadcast system (FIG.2), comprising:

receiving, at a head-end, a request for a video program from one of a plurality of subscriber stations (Col 1 lines 40-42, 56-60; Col 4 lines 31-44);
determining, at said head-end, whether said requested video program is associated with one of a plurality of subsets of channels, wherein said plurality of subsets of channels comprises a first subset of channels representing broadcasted channels having a first subscriber viewership level greater than a threshold level (FIG.3, item 304; Col 4 lines 53-57; Col 5 lines 1-16; known customer demand is a criteria for a threshold level; Static Channel Assignment is a first subset of channels), a second subset of channels representing broadcasted channels having a second subscriber viewership level greater less than said threshold level (Col 5 lines 16-18; if criteria is not met; then stays in another service class for Dynamic Channel Allocation, a second subset of channels), and a third subset of channels representing on-demand channels having a third subscriber viewership associated with video-on-demand (FIG.2, 214; Col 3 lines 40-42; FIG.3 item 305; Col 4 lines 53-57);

causing substantially continuous transmission of said first subset of broadcast channels from said head-end toward said plurality of subscriber stations (Static Channel Assignment is substantially continuous transmission);

causing transmission of said second subset of broadcast channels from said head- end to said plurality of subscriber stations based upon availability of channels in said second subset of channels and assigning video programming corresponding toward said request to an available one of said second subset of channels (FIG.5, items 501-505; Col 5 lines 29-47; assigning channels based on bandwidth availability); and

causing transmission of said third subset of on-demand channels from said head-end toward said plurality of subscriber stations upon assigning video programming corresponding to said request to an available one of said third subset of channels (Video on-demand is based on channel availability).

Regarding Claims 2 and 3, Rudrapatna further discloses collecting information from each of the corresponding subscriber stations regarding the frequency of channel usage and favorite channel selections and sending said collected information from said corresponding subscriber stations to a broadcast interconnect manager for managing broadcast channels and the narrowcast channels within a broadcast spectrum (FIG.6, items 601, 603-607; Col 6 lines 3-10; Col 3 lines 49-50).

Regarding Claim 4, Rudrapatna further discloses updating said plurality of subscriber stations with broadcast channel availability in a form of a channel map (FIG.3; Col 4 lines 26-31; Col 8 lines 15-20).

Regarding Claim 5, Rudrapatna further discloses said updating said plurality of subscriber stations with broadcast channel availability comprises: associating program identity, channel frequency, program availability and analog/digital format for each broadcast channel

(FIG.6; Col 8 lines 15-42, different encoding rates indicating digital format; Col 3 lines 40-42, menu driven user interface indicating program availability).

Regarding Claim 7, Rudrapatna further discloses sending a channel map modifier request to said subscriber station; adding a new channel to said channel map at said subscriber station in an instance said channel map modifier request comprises an add channel request (FIG.6; when a new service is added to a channel 607, the users are updated 615).

Regarding Claim 9, Rudrapatna further discloses transmitting said requested video program from said head-end to subscriber equipment associated with said request, via a transmission network characterized by a broadcast spectrum over which programs are transmitted to said plurality of subscriber stations (FIG.1; FIG.3; Col 2 lines 58 – Col 3 line 23).

Regarding Claim 10, Rudrapatna further discloses said broadcast spectrum comprises a semi-static broadcast portion of n channels, an on-demand broadcast portion of m channels, and a narrow-cast portion of p channels, where m, n, and p are integers greater than one, said method further comprising allocating a plurality of channel slots for each of said portions of channels (FIG.3, items 303, 304, 305).

Regarding Claim 11, Rudrapatna further discloses said first subset of broadcast channels comprises high viewership of channels associated with said first subset, said second subset of broadcast channels comprises lower viewership of channels associated with said second subset, said method further comprising:

dynamically changing, at said head-end, broadcast channel association with said first and second subsets of broadcast channels in response to changes in subscriber viewership (Col 5 lines 2-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rudrapatna et al (US 5,592,470) in view of Rao (US 5,940,738).

Regarding Claim 6, Rudrapatna discloses determining whether said requested channel is in said channel map; if so, tuning to said requested channel at each subscriber station (FIG.6, items 607, 615; Col 8 lines 13-20; a mapping table indicates available channels for user to select).

Rudrapatna is silent about if not in said channel map, adding said requested channel to said channel map in an instance where said requested channel is available from said head-end and tuning to said channel; and providing indicia that said requested channel is unavailable for viewing in an instance where said requested channel is unavailable.

In an analogous art, Rao discloses adding said requested channel to said channel map in an instance where said requested channel is available from said head-end and tuning to said channel (Col 19 lines 22-30, 52-60); and providing indicia that said requested channel is unavailable for viewing in an instance where said requested channel is unavailable (Col 21 lines 55-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify Rudrapatna's system to include adding a new requested channel if available and indicating unavailable if it is not available, as taught by Rao to add the benefits of channel bandwidth usage efficiency to the system.

Art Unit: 2623

5. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rudrapatna et al (US 5,592,470) in view of Gordon et al (US 5,920,700).

Regarding Claim 8, Rudrapatna discloses determining channel use of a channel listed in said channel map modifier request in an instance said channel map modifier request comprises a delete channel request to delete said channel associated with said delete channel request (FIG.6, items 607, 615; when a channel is replaced by a new service S_j the old service S_i is deleted from that channel).

Rudrapatna is silent about sending a channel in use response to said head-end in an instance a channel associated with said delete channel request is in use.

In an analogous art, Gordon discloses indication of an asset in use response to Operations in an instance an asset associated with said delete asset request is in use (Col 6 lines 30-39).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify Rudrapatna's system to include a channel in use response to said head-end in an instance a channel associated with said delete channel request is in use, as taught by Gordon to provide a more user friendly interface system.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fred Peng whose telephone number is (571) 270-1147. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 09:00-18:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivek Srivastava can be reached on (571) 272-7304. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Fred Peng
Patent Examiner

Vivek Srivastava
Supervisory Patent Examiner



VIVEK SRIVASTAVA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600